

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/579,329	07/13/2007	Yasushi Miyajima	290788US8PCT	1876	
OBLON, SPIV	7590 04/23/200 'AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE S	TREET	RAJAN, KAI			
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3769		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/23/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)			
	10/579,329	MIYAJIMA ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	KAI RAJAN	3769			

		KAI RAJAN	3769	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE RE	PLY FILED 03 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
ar ar fo	he reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or pilication, applicant must timely file one of the following pplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App (Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (riods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) 🗔 b) 🗵	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this <i>k</i> no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) MONTH'S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
nave bee under 37 set forth may redi	ns of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in flied is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later uce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. TI fil N	ne Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp ng the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte otice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	MENTS			
	he proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			cause
) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		. E below);	
	They are not deemed to place the application in be		duoina or aimplifuina ti	o inques for
(0	appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially rec	rucing or simplifying ti	ie issues ioi
(d	∑ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.	
	NOTE: Although the amendments to independent			dependent on
	claim 1, independent claims 20 and 26 contain ne- search and consideration. Applicant's arguments 41.33(a)).	w limitations that change the scope	of those inventions an	d require further
4 П т	he amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOI -324)
	applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Americanient (i	102-02-7
	lewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al		timely filed amendmen	t canceling the
	on-allowable claim(s).	novable ii odbilitted iii a ooparate;	amony mod dimondinor	it dansoning the
h	or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) by the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- ne status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an ex	planation of
	aim(s) allowed:			
	aim(s) objected to:			
	aim(s) rejected: <u>1 - 41.</u> aim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
	VIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
	ne affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	it before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	be entered
be w	ecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an as not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and
er	ne affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing the decause the affidavit or other evidence failed to lowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
	ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	in or the states of the claims after er	ing to below of attach	
11. 🛛 🛚	"he request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. 🔲 1	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

/Michael C. Astorino/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3769

Application No.

Part of Paper No. 20090420

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that Engstrom fails to disclose "an input device serving as a control input unit to any one of another electronic equipment." (Page 13 of remarks) It is the Examiner's position that the contended element is not actually claimed in claim 1. In particular, claim 1 does not recite the input device controlling other equipment. Instead, Applicant claims 'the input device is provided at an operation input unit....' Engstrom discloses a plurality of sensors disposed on and around the keypad of a cellular phone (see figures 1 and 2). As such, the sensors (input devices) are located at the operation input unit (keypad). Therefore, the applied prior art is sufficient to reject the claims as currently presented.